CURRENT NEWS EARLY BIRD

TUESDAY, April 28, 1998

Senate Readies for Comprehensive Debate on NATO Expansion

By Eric Schmitt

WASHINGTON -- After several desultory months of occasional hearings and monologues, the Senate began a real debate over the future of NATO on Monday. Advocates of expanding the military alliance said it would unite and stabilize Europe, but opponents argued that it would antagonize Russia and perhaps ignite a nuclear calamity.

"These countries are knocking at the door at the family of freedom," said Sen. Joseph Lieberman, D-Conn. "After all those years of living in effective slavery, they've turned to us and said, "We have have the opportunity to express our national will, to be free.'"

But Sen. John Warner, R-Va., warned that expansion now would commit Americans to underwriting a "blank check" to an ill-defined military organization.

"We'd be creating through this expansion a 911 organization," said Warner. "It will be, 'Call if there's a problem. Dial-a-cop, dial-a-soldier.'"

Last month, more than 20 senators gave speeches about the merits of admitting Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. But many senators complained that the most important foreign policy matter in decades was being treated like legislative filler and suggested that the Senate was slighting its constitutional duty to address a complex issue.

That changed Monday. Sen. Trent Lott of Mississippi, the majority leader, promised that NATO would be the Senate's primary legislative business until a final vote is taken later this week.

"We have not, will not and the Senate should not rush to judgment on a treaty of this magnitude," said Lott, who supports expansion.

Lott and his Democratic counterpart, Sen. Thomas Daschle of South Dakota, predicted that the Senate would overwhelmingly approve the expansion. Approval requires a two-thirds majority.

NATO supporters argue that enlarging the alliance improves U.S. national security by expanding the number of democratic countries in Europe. At the same time, enlarging NATO provides a hedge against a resurgent Russia, and enhances NATO's overall military capabilities. The Czech military, for example, is one the world's foremost experts in detecting chemical weapons.

Opponents argue that pushing NATO eastward will unsettle the much more important U.S.-Russia relationship and set back efforts to limit even further Moscow's nuclear arsenal. Critics also fear the United States may have to help pay to bring the military forces of new members up to NATO standards, and that NATO's traditional mission could be diluted by increasing peacekeeping roles.

The Clinton administration and congressional supporters of NATO expansion remain confident they have the votes, but an unusual coalition of liberal and conservative business leaders and activists, from Ben Cohen of Ben & Jerry's to Phyllis Schlafly, have mounted a grass-roots campaign in recent weeks to defeat the resolution.

For this reason, supporters are not letting up.

Daschle, saying "only the paranoid survive," invited Defense Secretary William Cohen to join him at a news conference to promote NATO expansion.

"For the United States to now reject it would be very destructive and cast a pall over the organization itself that would be detrimental to our interests for years to come," said Cohen.

The senators' statements were more spirited than they were a month ago, but they began as another set of serial monologues. After four hours of dueling monologues, however, something novel happened: Debate broke out.

It started when a leading supporter of NATO expansion, Sen. Joseph Biden, D-Del., responded to a pair of critics, Warner and Robert Smith, R-N.H.

"This is a veiled way of saying, 'Should we have NATO at all?'" Biden said. "NATO membership significantly reduces the prospect that anyone now or in the future would conclude you're a worthy target

U.N. Ignores Warnings and Extends Sanctions against Iraq

New York Times...See Pg. 3

Pentagon Makes Case for Opening Tomb

New York Times...See Pg. 4

Ethnic Conflict in Kosovo Intensifies

Ethnic Albanian Death Toll Rises as Serbian Authorities Escalate Offensive

Washington Post...See Pg. 5

of aggression."

"What is the urgency?" Smith reported. "What now is the threat that's perceived to be necessary to do this today or tomorrow, rather than give the Russians more time to make their reforms work."

Warner jumped into the fray: "Where is the instability? It's not in Poland, Hungary or the Czech Republic. It's in Russia."

Biden shot back, "The worst time to enlarge an alliance is at a moment of threat. This is the time and the moment, nine years after the wall has come down, to end once and for all the artificial boundaries."

Smith was not buying Biden's argument. "They picked winners and losers at Yalta," Smith said, referring to the allied summit that divided up post-World War II Europe. "We are picking winners and losers here."

With Lott's promise to focus on NATO this week, the Senate found its voice on a resolution to add three former foes to a military alliance formed nearly 50 years ago to stop the spread of Communism.

"If the Senate ratifies enlargement, we will have set the foundation for decades of European peace and prosperity," said Sen. Richard Lugar, R-Ind. "If we fail, historians may look back at the early post-Cold War period as a tragic loss of opportunities."

Then Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, D-N.Y., repeated his warning that enlarging NATO could lead the United States to "stumble into the catastrophe of nuclear war with Russia."

"We're right back to where we were in the 1950s," Moynihan said, evoking the hair-trigger tensions of the Cold War at its height. "The persons who conceived this extraordinarily successful strategy in the 1940s look up and say, 'Well, have you all gone mad? Do you realize what you're doing?'"

Earlier on the Senate floor, the speeches focused largely on the cost of NATO expansion -- the Pentagon says Washington's tab over 10 years would be $400 million -- and fears of inflaming Russian imperialism.

Other critics, like Sen. Jeff Bingaman, D-N.M., said NATO enlargement was a "distraction" to more pressing security threats such as terrorism, nuclear and chemical weapons proliferation, and the threat of accidental nuclear missile launches.

Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., who heads the Foreign Relations Committee, criticized some amendments that may be tacked on to the resolution, including one requiring that countries join the European Union before applying to NATO.

"With all due respect to our friends in Europe," Helms said, "the European Union could not fight its way out of a wet paper bag."

Washington Times April 28, 1998 Pg. 4

NATO expansion gets a White House push

By Nancy E. Roman and Sean Scully
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The White House moved yesterday to head off growing opposition to NATO expansion, sending Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen to Capitol Hill to soothe congressional fears.

"[Expanding NATO] is a unique opportunity for increasing and enhancing America's security, Europe's stability and the future prosperity, indeed, of much of Eastern and Central Europe," he said.

NATO expansion originally looked like an easy win for the president. Congress has passed resolutions calling for expansion every year since 1994, and the issue was part of the 1996 presidential platforms of both parties.

But an odd anti-expansion coalition has developed in recent weeks, joining liberals such as Sen. Paul Wellstone, Minnesota Democrat, with conservatives such as Sen. Bob Smith, Oregon Republican.

Mr. Cohen came to the Hill four days after Senate GOP leader Trent Lott of Mississippi, who backs NATO expansion, accused the White House of being "asleep at the throttle." He said expansion could lose without immediate attention.

Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, South Dakota Democrat, is heeding the warning. "I think we're OK," he said of the last-minute lobbying by supporters. "But only the paranoid survive."

Critics say an expanded alliance, which would add Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the 50-year-old pact, could be costly and would drive Russia into the arms of the Chinese.

"This undermines democratic forces [in Russia] and also undermines the people responsible for overthrowing communism," Mr. Wellstone said.

Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, New York Democrat, said expansion could mean nuclear war. The Russians are feeling increasingly isolated and threatened by the expanding West, he said, while the West must defend new NATO members that are not easily reached by tanks and guns, leaving nuclear weapons as the defense of necessity.

Sen. John W. Warner, Virginia Republican, said the expansion is a "blank check" written by the U.S. taxpayers. He said the United States could be liable for untold billions of dollars in the effort to integrate the new countries into the alliance.

Mr. Cohen denied that an expanded NATO is a threat to Russia. "I don't see this in any way as sparking the kind of regression [in U.S.-Russian relations] that is voiced by some," he said.

And he said the costs will be lower than critics say — from $1.5 billion to $6 billion, not the $120 billion that some fear. But he acknowledged that this does not include the costs of upgrading the aging arsenals now used by the three former Warsaw Pact nations.

To counter Mr. Cohen, opponents of expansion reached out for high-profile help. Mr. Moynihan and Mr. Warner circulated a letter from Paul H. Nitze, longtime presidential adviser and an architect of the policy of "containment," opposing NATO expansion.

We are in "an era in which we would be foolish to squander the opportunities opened by the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union ... [but] the open-ended expansion being proposed for the alliance points toward increasing friction with post-Communist Russia for years to come," Mr. Nitze wrote.

There are now 16 NATO members. Besides the three in the current round of expansion, 18 others would like to join, including Slovenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Slovakia, Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia.

It takes two-thirds of the Senate to ratify or revise a treaty. The Senate could vote as early as this evening, but leaders say debate will likely drag into tomorrow.

Can't Russia Join the Club, Too?

Newsweek
May 4, 1998
Pg. 44

If the NATO alliance is about strengthening democracy, the troubled nation should get its own invitation. BY FAREED ZAKARIA

THE EXPANSION OF NATO IS A FOREGONE CONCLUSION. The Senate will soon vote overwhelmingly to extend membership in the alliance to Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic. But while they're at it, the senators might think about adding one more name to that list—Russia.

This is not nearly as preposterous as it sounds. Having succeeded in its original mission—to deter the Soviet Union—NATO is somewhat lost in this new era. Expansion, the Clinton administration has stressed, is an ongoing policy that could result in many new members. That will further change the essential nature of the alliance, moving it from a tight military camp to a larger crisis-solving and democracy-strengthening organization. In this new context, Russian participation becomes indispensable.

Few alliances survive victory. After having come together to defeat Napoleon, the Quadruple Alliance soon fell apart in the 1820s and 1830s. NATO has done better. It still exists, has a large bureaucracy, conducts military maneuvers and is used by the United States as its preferred military outfit when force is required. But its core function—defending its members from Soviet attack—is dead; as dead as the Soviet Union.

The United States still has many problems dealing with Russia, but they stem from Russian weakness rather than strength. Russia's economy today is slightly more than half the size it was 15 years ago, and has declined for five straight years. Its military is in ruins, with salaries, food and medicine in scarce supply, let alone modern tanks and aircraft.

Additionally, Russia's new borders are farther away from those of NATO members—including the new countries of Central Europe—than they have been for 300 years. Yet NATO has responded to this precipitous decline in Russian power and its diminished imperial intentions by bulking up and getting closer. The administration has given a wink and a nod to the Baltic states, which want to be next in the club. Their membership would almost certainly end any pretense of credible security guarantees: NATO could defend the Baltics by only one means—nuclear attack.

All this is old thinking, we are told by the Clinton administration. The new NATO is meant to deal with the new world. Precisely because there are no longer actual threats to the security of Western Europe and other members, the alliance must deal with those threats that exist—whether in Bosnia or the Middle East—which require a new, expanded alliance. "NATO must go out of area or out of business," says Sen. Richard Lugar. This turns NATO into a kind of off-the-shelf army that might be used when its members can agree. But as the war in Bosnia bloodily proved, NATO members can't really agree on much. Out of area—in Libya, Iran, Iraq, the peace process, China—the United States and Europe are out of sync.

Hence, when the United States wants to use military force, it will try to get NATO support. If not, it will go alone. And if it gets a few NATO countries and a few non-NATO ones to come along, it will construct a "coalition of the willing." So how exactly is the new, improved NATO helping here? If global problem-solving is NATO's new mission, it can work only with the cooperation of other great powers—principally Russia, which straddles two continents and has the world's second largest nuclear arsenal and a veto in the Security Council. To try to construct an international security system and leave Russia out because it lost the cold war contradicts the most simple rule of strategy for the victorious. Written across the first page of Churchill's magnificent history of World War II is the four-line "moral of the work," which reads: "In War—Resolution; In Defeat—Defiance; In Victory—Magnanimity; In Peace—Goodwill." The last time a losing power was excluded from the new order was Germany in 1918, and things didn't turn out so well.

There is, finally, the moral argument. We are told that the countries of Central Europe deserve to be recognized as full-fledged members of the West, and their fledgling democracies supported and strengthened. But if one of NATO's new goals is to strengthen democracy, then surely its place lies with the most important democratic experiment taking place on the European continent—in Russia. The Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary are in no real danger of backsliding on democracy. What they need is access to West European markets. Membership in the European Union, not NATO, can alone solve that problem. But the fate of Russian democracy is in the balance, and the outcome will have enormous consequences for the democratic idea everywhere and for peace in Europe. Why not help where help is needed?

As for belonging to "the West," Central Europe has many cultural affinities with Western Europe, but surely they are matched by those of Russia. Which has made a larger contribution to European culture: Hungary or the land of Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Pushkin, Prokofiev, Kandinsky and Shostakovich? Bringing Russia firmly into the West is a goal worthy of the United States—and its Senate.

New York Times April 28, 1998 Pg. 1

U.N. Ignores Warnings and Extends Sanctions Against Iraq

By Barbara Crossette

UNITED NATIONS -- The Security Council decided Monday night to extend sanctions against Iraq, ignoring threats from Baghdad that it would disrupt future arms inspections if the sanctions were not lifted.

"No member of the council is arguing for the lifting of sanctions against Iraq," Sir John Weston, Britain's representative, said near the end of a daylong debate on the matter.

But in a gesture to the Iraqis, who have recently allowed greater access to arms inspectors, the council also decided that in the future, reviews of sanctions would take place every 60 days. That was the procedure before Iraq instigated a series of crises last year, bringing President Saddam Hussein and the United States to the brink of war by late January.

However, diplomats do not expect the next big push for a lifting or easing the sanctions until October, when the next major report on Iraqi compliance is due from the United Nations Special Commission, which has been in charge of eliminating Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and its capacity to make more.

The United States has vowed to veto any lifting of the sanctions, imposed in 1990, until Iraq has met a number of requirements, not only verifiable disarmament but also the return of Kuwaiti prisoners and property seized in the 1990 Iraqi invasion and a general improvement in respecting human rights.

Although there was never a chance that Iraq would be freed

from sanctions in this review -- the first since an agreement in February between President Hussein and Secretary-General Kofi Annan that defused the most recent crisis -- the atmosphere around Monday's Security Council meeting was noticeably different from previous sessions on the issue.

Bill Richardson, the U.S. representative, was somewhat conciliatory in his assessment of Iraq's recent performance.

Richardson, facing eroding support for unlimited sanctions, acknowledged some Iraqi progress in disarmament, including meeting most demands of nuclear inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency. But he continues to object to Russian, Chinese and French calls to "close the file" on nuclear weapons and shift from an active "search and destroy" phase of disarmament to long-term monitoring.

Russia has proposed a formal resolution making the change, which the United States opposes. Iraq's foreign minister said in an interview on Saturday that he expected the Russians and Americans to work out a compromise. Diplomats say that it will take the form of a council statement endorsing the finding that there is no evidence of a nuclear-weapons program without formally graduating Iraq from one level of inspection to a less severe one.

"We in the United States acknowledge progress in areas like access to Presidential and sensitive sites," Richardson said. "There appears to be some progress in the nuclear file, but we believe that it is premature to totally close that file without further steps being taken specifically regarding nuclear enrichment, design and nuclear exports."

Shen Guofeng, China's new deputy representative to the United Nations and former Foreign Ministry spokesman, argued not only for closing the nuclear weapons file now but also for moving to end sanctions generally "because the Iraqi people are suffering a lot." But he acknowledged that Iraq still had requirements to meet.

The council heard Monday from Richard Butler, executive chairman of the special commission in charge of eliminating Iraq's biological, chemical and missile programs, and Garry Dillon, leader of the International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors.

Butler has found no progress on outstanding issues in the last six months and Dillon, while more upbeat, still has some unanswered questions.

Jayantha Dhanapala, who led diplomatic escorts on a tour of eight Iraqi presidential sites being inspected by the commission, also reported to the council on the generally smooth initial visits to the properties. It is unclear. however, what will happen when inspectors want to return for further inspections.

The United States, increasingly isolated among council members who say that eight years of sanctions are enough, gets its strongest support from Britain, whose diplomats caution against shifting the debate from Iraqi compliance to Iraqi suffering.

In an interview on Friday, Sir John said the starting point of the debate on Iraq is the potential President Hussein still has to produce biological and chemical weapons and missiles -- information spelled out in a series of new reports, including several from independent teams of experts Iraq thought would be more willing to accept its contention that it was free of prohibited arms.

"We've had a reality check," Sir John said. "From this, I draw the conclusion that we are facing a policy of lying on an epic scale that recalls only the policies in that respect of earlier dictators in this century. While there will always be, as Lenin put it, useful fools who will rush in to embrace people who pump out this kind of nonsense, I don't think that the U.N.'s general standing in the world is so high right now that it can allow itself to be duped by this kind of thing."

Britain recently organized a conference in London to discuss how food, medicine and other civilian goods could be supplied more quickly and effectively to Iraqis. Baghdad objected to the conference, saying it infringed on Iraqi sovereignty.

Last weekend, Iraqi newspapers reported that Iraq was further cutting its own rations to its people, citing difficulties with the plan under which limited amounts of oil are sold to pay for essential supplies. The "oil for food" program, which was to have supplemented government rations, now almost entirely supplants them.

At the same time, private American groups are stepping up deliveries of goods to Iraq, to protest continued sanctions and aid Iraqis at the same time. Some of the groups, including numerous church organizations, want to build a movement in the United States against support for sanctions.

In an interview on Saturday, Iraq's foreign minister, Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, said he was "grateful that there are these fair-minded people in America."

"We owe them gratitude with all our hearts," he said.

New York Times April 28, 1998 Pg. 1

Pentagon Makes Case for Opening Tomb

By Steven Lee Myers

WASHINGTON -- On a rainy Memorial Day 14 years ago, six gray horses slowly pulled a black caisson from Capitol Hill to Arlington National Cemetery, where the remains of an unidentified American killed in Vietnam were laid to rest in the Tomb of the Unknowns, as an emotional President Reagan looked on.

The tomb, inscribed after World War I to honor the original Unknown Soldier, reads, "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God." But Monday officials at the Pentagon recommended reopening the tomb after concluding that in all likelihood, new tests will show that the latest remains belong to one of two American pilots shot down over South Vietnam on the same day in 1972.

The final decision will be up to Secretary of Defense William Cohen, who said it could come as early as next week. But the officials spent much of the day outlining their recommendation to members of Congress, representatives of veterans' groups and relatives of nine Americans still missing in action from Vietnam whose remains could, at least theoretically, lie in the tomb.

It was a measure of the emotional sensitivity of the issue that the Pentagon announced the preliminary recommendation so a "consultative phase" could begin on whether to open the tomb, one of the nation's most revered sites.

Although the announcement was greeted with solemn understanding on Capitol Hill, a decision to remove the remains -- and probably identify them -- is sure to revive deep and conflicting emotions about the war.

Althea Strobridge, the mother of Capt. Rodney L. Strobridge, an Army helicopter pilot shot down in 1972 and one of the two whose remains the Pentagon now believes may lie in the tomb, said Monday she was not certain she wanted all the answers.

"If he is in there, what good is it going to do?" Ms. Strobridge said in a telephone interview from her home in Perry, Iowa. "My son is -- I couldn't hug him or anything."

Monday's announcement followed a four-month investigation ordered by Cohen after news reports that the remains in the tomb had at one time been identified as those of 1st Lt. Michael J. Blassie, an Air Force pilot whose attack jet crashed in flames near An Loc, South Vietnam, on May 11, 1972, the same day that Strobridge died.

Blassie's family had appealed to the Pentagon to disinter the remains and conduct mitochondrial DNA tests that would establish that the set of six bones, resting in a crypt next to the unidentified remains of soldiers from the two World Wars and Korea, belongs to him.

"All we ever wanted was an answer: Is that Michael Blassie or not?" Pat Blassie, the lieutenant's sister, said in an inter-

view from her Atlanta home. "And we truly believe it is. We are very encouraged that we're at this point."

Blassie's family and their supporters have suggested that the Pentagon deliberately obscured the identity of the remains in a rush to declare an unknown soldier from Vietnam during the Reagan administration.

At the Pentagon, however, the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, Charles Cragin, said Monday that an investigation by a group of senior officials had concluded that the decisions first to identify the remains as Blassie's and then in 1978 to reclassify them as unidentified were honest ones made with the best information and technology available. He also said there "no reason to question" the decision in 1984 to place the remains in the Tomb of the Unknowns.

"We found nothing in our evaluation that led us to conclude they'd made anything but the right decision, given the facts as they knew them at the time," Cragin said of the analysts who classified the bones.

Witnesses had reported watching Blassie's A-37B attack jet crash, and a helicopter rescue mission found no signs that the pilot had survived; but the area remained under intense siege, thwarting a thorough search for remains.

It was not until five months later that South Vietnamese soldiers found remains and personal items -- including Blassie's identification card and remnants of a flight suit -- from a single site near An Loc. Although some of the personal items were lost in Saigon, officials still identified the remains as Blassie's.

In 1978, however, the Pentagon's Central Identification Laboratory in Hawaii found that the blood type of the remains (O negative) did not match Blassie's and that the size of one of the bones (a right humerus, or upper arm) did not correspond to his height. That led the laboratory to reclassify the remains as unknown.

The Pentagon has since concluded that the remains could belong to any one of eight other Americans who are listed as missing in action, all of them pilots or crew members of two aircraft and two helicopters that crashed in the same area around the same time.

But Cragin said the blood type and humerus largely rule out all but Strobridge, who was 30 when the Cobra attack helicopter he was piloting crashed during the same siege. Other evidence found with the remains, however, points to Blassie, including an ejection seat and life raft, which helicopters did not routinely carry.

Cragin said only the DNA tests, which can match remains to living maternal relatives, were likely to resolve the matter.

Sen. Robert Smith, R-N.H., who has called for testing the remains, said Pentagon officials had ignored evidence over the years that raised questions about the unknown soldier's identity. But he said he supported the recommendation to test the remains.

"If the Tomb of the Unknowns is going to remain sacred," Smith said, "the remains should be unknown."

If the remains are removed and identified, the Pentagon would face another daunting decision: whether to replace them. There are still 2,093 Americans missing from the Vietnam War, and the laboratory in Hawaii slowly continues to identify them.

Washington Post April 28, 1998 Pg. 11

Ethnic Conflict in Kosovo Intensifies

Ethnic Albanian Death Toll Rises as Serbian Authorities Escalate Offensive

By Guy Dinmore
Special to The
Washington Post

EREC, Yugoslavia—Adem Nacaj shuddered and then wept as he lifted the lid of the coffin containing his son Veli, 30. "These Serbs are war criminals. What they are doing is unbelievable," he cried.

In all, 19 coffins were laid out in a bare room thick with the stench of death. Outside more relatives gathered to identify the bodies. All were young ethnic Albanian men said by the authorities to have been killed by Yugoslav army troops last Thursday while attempting to smuggle arms from Albania into Serbia's restive province of Kosovo.

The truth may never be known. Villagers insisted that some of the dead had been arrested days before the border clashes. Skender Bajraktari claimed his brother Halil had disappeared on April 19 after he went to buy food.

The village -- known as Erec to the Serbs and Hereq to Kosovo's ethnic Albanian majority -- lies just five miles from the snow-capped mountains that form the border with Albania. During yesterday's funeral for nine of the dead, occasional gunfire and explosions could be heard from a nearby hill where Serbian police have pinned down guerrillas of the separatist Kosovo Liberation Army in the village of Babaloc.

Kosovo is the southern province of Serbia, Yugoslavia's dominant republic. The province's long-simmering crisis has intensified since special Serbian police units launched an offensive on Feb. 28 against suspected guerrilla strongholds in the central Drenica area near Pristina, the provincial capital. More than 80 ethnic Albanians were killed, many of them women and children.

Defying Western calls for a withdrawal of military and special police units from the province, the federal Yugoslav government is conducting a massive show of force. Heavily armed police man checkpoints protected by sandbags along main roads. The Yugoslav army has brought in hundreds of reinforcements, as well as tanks and artillery, to guard the porous border with Albania. Some are digging positions deeper inside Kosovo near the villages of Babaloc and Glodjane where armed ethnic Albanians are concentrated.

Serbian officials said border troops early today killed three Albanians smuggling weapons over the mountains. The Democratic League of Kosovo, the main ethnic Albanian party, accused the army of launching an artillery attack on the village of Voksa, killing about a dozen people. Police barred reporters from the area, and no independent confirmation was possible.

Unidentified gunmen opened fire on a Japanese Embassy vehicle near the central village of Lausa, occupied by ethnic Albanians and ringed by police. In the car, a diplomat in Kosovo to investigate conditions here was uninjured; the car's driver suffered minor injuries.

Western diplomats fear the inter-ethnic violence is spinning out of control and risks destabilizing Albania as well as neighboring Macedonia, which has a large ethnic Albanian minority.

The Serbian authorities report daily attacks by separatist "terrorists" against police posts and what the government calls "loyal Albanians." On the other side, the Democratic League of Kosovo, which demands independence for the province, names numerous Albanians killed or wounded in villages surrounded by police in the Drenica and border areas. It also accuses police of arming Serbian civilians.

The government in Belgrade has rejected the demands of the international community and shrugged off a U.N. arms embargo and limited economic sanctions imposed by Western powers. There is little sign of even a first meeting between the government, which has offered the province limited self-rule, and the Kosovo Albanians led by Ibrahim Rugova, who insists on full independence.

Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic, politically weaker than when he rose to power 10 years ago, is reviving his image as Serbia's nationalist strongman. In a referendum last week Serbs overwhelmingly endorsed his rejection of foreign mediation in Kosovo.

U.S. officials have said the United States will push for

additional sanctions against Belgrade when representatives of the six-nation Yugoslav "contact group" meet in Rome on Wednesday. The tough U.S. stance is backed by Britain and Germany but less so by the other members -- France, Italy and Russia.

"I am pessimistic," said Blerim Shala, a spokesman for a 15-member team set up by Rugova to prepare a platform for talks. "I don't see a serious attempt by the international community to stop this conflict."

Shala also acknowledged that probably no politician within Kosovo has the power to curb the separatist guerrillas, who are funded and organized by radical Albanian exiles in Switzerland and Germany. The poorly organized and equipped rebels lost one of their main commanders in Drenica last month but have broadened their popular support in the wake of the recent crackdown.

The despair among politicians in the relative calm of Pristina is far more intense among villagers who have sent their women and children to the safety of urban areas and their young men to Albania to collect weapons.

"This is the guilt of Europe," said one man in Erec, pointing to the 19 coffins. "What are the Germans doing? Where are the Americans? You are talking and sleeping. . . . We can only go into the woods now."

European Stars & Stripes
April 28, 1998 Pg. 4

U.S. pilot ejects over Persian Gulf

DUBAI, United Arab Emirates (AP) — A U.S. fighter jet crashed in gulf waters Monday, but the pilot ejected and was recovered by a U.S. helicopter, a U.S. statement said.

"The aircraft, assigned to Strike Fighter Squadron 192 ... went down just after 1300 GMT. A helicopter from USS Independence recovered the pilot, who was uninjured," said a brief statement from the public affairs office of the U.S. Naval Forces Central Command at 5th Fleet headquarters in Bahrain. The statement said the cause of the accident was under investigation.

The plane was launched from the aircraft carrier Independence, which is in the Persian Gulf to patrol the southern no-fly zone in Iraq — where Iraqi aircraft are not allowed to fly under a U.N. resolution. The F/A-18 Hornet is flown by both the Navy and Marine Corps. It can perform either air-to-air combat or ground attack missions.

Washington Post April 28, 1998 Pg. 6

New Methods Help Maintain Nuclear Arms

Some Aging U.S. Weapons Will Be Rebuilt in Effort to Ensure Long-Term Reliability

By Walter Pincus
Washington Post
Staff Writer

While the Clinton administration urges the Senate to ratify treaties that end nuclear testing and sharply cut the number of U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons, U.S. government scientists are pressing ahead with new methods for keeping thousands of strategic missile warheads and bombs reliable and accurate for at least 25 more years.

The program, overseen by the Pentagon and Department of Energy (DOE), has begun rebuilding some of the approximately 9,000 nuclear warheads that remain in America's arsenal to keep the U.S. deterrent credible, in part by extending the life of some weapons.

For example, the Mark 21 reentry vehicles that contain the nuclear warheads on MX intercontinental ballistic missiles are scheduled to be taken off those ICBMs and refurbished to make them reliable beyond the year 2025, according to Gene Ives, deputy assistant secretary of energy for military applications and stockpile management.

In the 1980s, when the MX reentry vehicle and its 350-kiloton W87 warhead were first designed and produced, the two were expected to be deployed for 20 years, until 2009, according to documents.

The $4.1 billion-a-year DOE stockpile stewardship and management program has drawn steady criticism from anti-nuclear groups for more than a year. The Los Alamos Study Group, a collection of 39 disarmament and environmental groups, last week again called for a halt in the program. Greg Mello, the group's director, said the DOE program reveals "a shocking disregard for U.S. commitments, especially those enshrined in the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to end the nuclear arms race."

But Thomas Graham, a former senior official with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said that without the DOE program, the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would have almost no chance for approval by the Republican-controlled Senate, where lawmakers have expressed concern about maintaining the U.S. capacity to wage nuclear war in an age when new limits are being placed on its aging arsenal.

Originally chosen for the MX in 1982, the Mark 21 and W87 nuclear warhead deliver a hydrogen bomb with an explosive power more than 25 times greater than the device that destroyed Hiroshima. Each of the 100 currently deployed MX missiles carries nine to 11 separately targeted Mark 21 reentry vehicles.

The Mark 21/W87 combination was chosen as the first nuclear weapon to be refurbished under the program because of its potential role after the ratification of START II, the reduction agreement awaiting approval by the Senate and the Russian Duma. That agreement calls for multiple warhead ICBMs such as the MX to be dismantled. According to Ives, the Mark 21/W87 "is the warhead of choice" for the new single-warhead Minuteman III ICBM allowed by the treaty.

Radioactive materials in nuclear weapons decay over time, and the plastic, metal and other organic parts in warheads and bombs age and react to radioactivity. "Material breakdown occurs from exposure to radiation, higher than normal temperatures and gases that accumulate over time in a hermetically sealed weapon environment," C. Bruce Tarter, director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, told Congress recently.

As a result, new techniques are being used to sample gases as an early warning of decay within the stockpile. In addition, a selection of the warheads and reentry vehicles, normally 11 systems a year, has regularly been tested every year, along with their missile and bomb delivery systems.

And although the stockpile is regularly certified to the president as reliable, there has never been a complete test of a nuclear ICBM from launch through space flight to nuclear explosion. No test H-bomb with a real warhead has ever been dropped from an airplane since the atmospheric test ban went into effect in 1964.

Before Congress approved a nuclear test moratorium and President George Bush suspended all U.S. underground testing in 1992, nuclear devices, based on past and future warhead designs, were regularly exploded in caverns beneath the Nevada Nuclear Test Site and at South Pacific test areas. These experimental explosions helped verify the reliability of the stockpile and provided data for future weapon designs.

To replace actual nuclear tests, Los Alamos and Sandia national laboratories have acquired advanced computers that will simulate nuclear explosions. Livermore has under construction the $1.2 billion National Ignition Facility, whose immense laser capability will allow simulation of weapons-like fusion effects.

Under current schedules, the

Mark 21s are to be taken off the MX and the W87 warheads sent to the DOE Pantex plant outside Amarillo, Tex. They will be taken apart there, with the plutonium triggers sent to Los Alamos in New Mexico and Livermore in California for examination. The remaining nuclear components of the bombs will be sent to Oak Ridge, Tenn., for study.

"We conceptually divide the explosion sequence into each of its parts and test and analyze each of these separately, much as you would test the ignition system, the cooling system and the brakes on your car," Victor H. Reis, assistant secretary of defense programs at DOE, told Congress last month.

There are fewer warheads and types of systems in the stockpile than at any time since the 1960s, when the nuclear arms race began in earnest. With seven nuclear missile and bomb systems now operational and the average age of each at 15 years, the U.S. stockpile "is older than ever before," according to a DOE publication.

"No signs of catastrophic aging" have been uncovered to date in DOE's more comprehensive stockpile stewardship program, according to Livermore's Tarter. There have been some unspecified problems, which officials said were promptly fixed.

Defense Daily April 28, 1998 Pg. 6

TEXAS GROUP SUES U.S., GERMAN AIR FORCES OVER LOW FLIGHTS

Greg Caires

A group of West Texas landowners last week filed suit against against the U.S. Air Force and the German Luftwaffe to protest low altitude fighter jet training over their property. The lawsuit, which will be heard by the U.S. Federal District Court in Pecos, Texas, could restrict flight training exercises held in the Davis Mountain region of West Texas.

The group of landowners also named the U.S. Department of Defense in the suit.

According to the lawsuit, low flying military jets would "ruin the serenity of the mountain region" and would "disrupt" the area's ranching industry because the planned flight training exercises are reported to require jets to fly almost at the speed of sound at no more than 100 feet above the ground. Such flight profiles could scatter cattle, hurt tourism and "ruin the quality of life for people who work and live here," according to a statement released by the landowners.

The landowners are seeking an injunction that would stop the proposed flights until the lawsuit--which claims that the Air Force failed to follow the proper procedures for flight approval required by the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA)--can be heard.

According to the landowners' statement, the law provides a method for considering the environmental impact of aircraft maneuvers, which includes human and animal safety as well as noise and air pollution. According to Air Force officials, training operations at Holloman AFB, N.M. could be affected by the lawsuit.

Holloman--the home of the 49th Wing and the F-117 stealth fighter--is also used by the German Air Force to train pilots to fly the Tornado strike fighter. While these units primarily train in southern New Mexico, the need to increase the reality of flight training exercises has prompted the Air Force to consider gaining flying access to other areas--such as the Davis Mountain region of West Texas.

National Journal April 25, 1998 Pg. 932

ATTENTION, PENTAGON SHOPPERS!

By Sydney J. Freedberg Jr.

It was not the perfect start to a new job. Stan Soloway had just been named deputy undersecretary of Defense for acquisition reform, and was still waiting for his formal security clearance, when the story broke on March 18 that the Pentagon's inspector general had found the department overpaying for certain spare parts--in one case, nearly $76 for a single screw.

The media accounts downplayed key details, such as the fact that $76 was the price commercial customers paid as well. And it also missed the big picture, outside observers say: The $76 screw aside, the Defense acquisitions system--once the archetype of inefficiency-- has made real strides toward reform since the 1993 establishment of the acquisition reform office, a small policy workshop, and especially since the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 and the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1996.

In the words of Steven Kelman, formerly the head of the Office of Management and Budget's Office of Federal Procurement Policy and now an acquisitions expert at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government: "DoD, through acquisition reform, has been saving billions and billions of dollars."

Examples abound. The acquisitions workforce, as estimated by the General Accounting Office (GAO), is a third smaller than in 1994. The largest acquisitions agency and once the most notorious, the Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC), boasts that since 1995 the Air Force has cut the number of pages in its acquisitions instructions by about 64 per cent, the number of requests to contractors for specific technical data by 77 per cent and the number of specifications and standards by 84 per cent. The Army Materiel Command (AMC) once had 12,000 specifications and standards; it has kept only 2,000.

Supporting documents for contracts once totaled thousands of pages-- Bert Concklin, the president of the Professional Services Council, recalls working on a 500,000-page proposal-- but have been trimmed to a few hundred. The Pentagon's private-sector suppliers are breathing sighs of relief. "The advent of oral proposals [especially]," said John Delane, president of base maintenance contractor Del-Jen Inc., "is really a godsend."

After decades of piling on the paperwork to keep contractors like Delane honest, the Defense Department has adopted a new philosophy: Trust. Said Concklin, "The government, to the surprise of many or most in the private sector, has really, to a remarkable degree, been willing to get into an interactive, healthy, positive partnership with us." All of the services now use "integrated product teams," on which industry representatives sit side by side with government officials to shepherd projects through. The Marine Corps's Advanced Amphibious Assault Vehicle project is actually co-located with its prime contractor's factory, and one Navy missile range now rents itself out to private companies under the name "Space Port Florida." Soloway himself embodies the new spirit: He comes to the Pentagon from the private sector, after 10 years as a consultant to the Contract Services Association of Amer-

ica, a leading industry group.

Such close collaboration carries risks, but experts say that the elaborate oversight system had come to cost more than the problems it was intended to prevent. The new philosophy, explained Maj. Gen. Roy Beauchamp, head of the Army's Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command, is that "we don't think every contractor that we do business with is a crook." A new emphasis on past performance gives acquisitions officials the authority to evaluate bids based on a company's record as well as its proffered price.

The hoped-for benefits are not only financial. The Information Age military that won the Persian Gulf war feeds on rapidly changing technology. Products become obsolete in only 18 months, Soloway explained. So, rather than laboriously design every item to rigid military specifications, the Pentagon has moved to a "plug-and-play" approach that quickly slots new civilian technology into old weapons. Beauchamp boasts that, though it looks identical from the outside, "the M1A2 SEP tank today . . . is as different from the basic Ml tank that was produced in 1983 as the Ml tank was . . . from the [1960-vintage] M60 tank it replaced."

Loren Thompson, of the libertarian-leaning Alexis de Tocqueville Institution, summed up the progress this way: "Pentagon acquisition reform initiatives have come a great distance conceptually, a significant distance culturally and"-- with a laugh-- "let's say, a moderate distance in terms of actual implementation. . . .We have 40 years of Cold War practices that have to be deconstructed, and that takes time."

Pentagon officials agree that cultural change is critical. "When I first began in this business 25 years ago," recalled Beauchamp, "it was a very rigid process, it had td be approved every step of the way with very rigidly defined specifications. . . . [a] very risk-averse environment."

"I was trained to be a risk avoider," echoed Glenn Miller, a 29-year veteran of Air Force acquisitions who now heads the AFMC's requirements initiative. "Today we're telling people, manage your risk."

That shift requires training. LeRoy Haugh a vice president of the Aerospace Industries Association of America and a 40-year acquisitions veteran himself, frets that Defense is not doing enough to reach "the people down in the trenches." Soloway's goal is 40 hours of mandatory continuing education per person per year. Already his office orchestrates a Pentagon-wide "Acquisition Reform Week"-- this year's, the third annual, begins on May 4 to showcase reform and provide intensive training. Using techniques first developed by the Army, each service conducts "road shows" year-round in which acquisition reform experts visit each major local office for several days of exercises with test-case acquisitions. A complementary system of "just-in-time training" responds to local offices' requests for help by sending out experts to walk them through their immediate problems.

Is all of this sinking in? Both the Army and the Air Force Materiel Commands say exhaustive internal surveys show that it is. Kelman, who has embarked on his own government-wide survey, agrees: Most acquisitions workers, he said, are telling him that "we did so much crap before, we did so much that didn't make sense... [now] finally I feel like a real human being, rather than a paper pusher."

But that is not the only reaction. One recently retired Navy acquisitions officer, referring to the troubled C-17 cargo plane program, warned that "when you see people getting fired for making a mistake... the willingness of the system to take chances the next time is not apparent. Soloway admitted that "if we get to a point where the workforce is saying to us... 'Yeah, I think that's a good idea, but I'm afraid if I don't do it just right, the 'hammer's gonna come down on my head'-- we're dead in the water." Amid the uproar over the $76 screw, Soloway said, "the message to them has to be: 'OK' you made a mistake. . . . Fine. Now you learn from it, we move on and you keep trying.'"

Equally novel and equally important is the restrained reaction of Congress to the recent blow-up. For four decades, acquisitions experts say, each acquisitions blunder led to public outcry and new legislation-- layer on well-intentioned layer of protection until the system could hardly move. Compare the comment of Sen. Rick Santorum. R-Pa., chairman of the Armed Services Acquisition and Technologies; Subcommittee, on the $76 screw: "When this latest thing came out . . . people were saying, 'Here it is, the Pentagon doing this all over again'; and my comment was: 'These are isolated instances. . . . It's hard to change an organization of several hundred thousand people overnight.'"

Some in the House are not so sanguine. "We've been undertaking procurement reform initiatives for 18 years." complained Rep. Duncan L. Hunter, R-Calif., a Vietnam combat veteran, "and it's still a very inefficient system." Pointedly comparing the acquisitions workforce--roughly 300,000 strong-- to the Marine Corps-- 170,000-- Hunter said, "The Department of Defense should be able to operate effectively with as many shoppers as there are U.S. marines."

Hunter and House National Security Committee chairman Floyd Spence, R-S.C., introduced a plan to cut the acquisitions work-force to the size of the Marine Corps over four years. Passed by, the House, the measure was watered down in conference.

A crucial problem was agreeing on how many acquisitions workers there are now. Hunter cites a Congressional Budget Office estimate of roughly 300,000; after a half-hour of caveats, a senior GAO evaluator allowed that there might be 320,000. In the face of this uncertainty, the House's cut-- of well over 100,000 positions-- was bargained down to 25,000, with a waiver that would allow Defense to cut just 10,000. Soloway said the Pentagon is still studying the matter and will report in June on whether it will invoke the waiver.

So Soloway has his work cut out for him.

In an interview, he vibrated with enthusiasm: " One of the reasons I was eager to come over here when I was offered the opportunity was, if you look back over the last five years, you had probably one of the most successful stories in the history of government."

But the end of that story is not yet written. With the eyes of Congress upon them, and with the world's largest, most complicated buying system in their care, Soloway and his colleagues will certainly need such enthusiasm if they are to press ahead.

TRIMMING THE FAT

The Pentagon's acquisitions workforce has dropped steadily in recent years, but not enough to satisfy some critics:

'The cutback in personnel has been accompanied by reductions in paperwork. Some examples:

* The Air Force cut the number of pages in all its acquisition policy documents by 64 per cent, from 10,698 pages to 3,909 pages.
* The Army slashed the number of individual specifications and standards from 12,000 to 2,000, an 84 per cent reduction.
* The Air Force reduced the number of individual specifications and standards from 5,000 to 800, also an 84 per cent reduction.
* The Air Force reduced the number of requests to contractors for specific technical data by 77 per cent.

SOURCES: Air Force Material Command, Army Material Command

Wall Street Journal
April 28, 1998
Pg. 1

Work Week

A Special News Report About Life On the Job — and Trends Taking Shape There

A NICHE MARKET in the staffing industry: placing military veterans.

Hire Quality Inc., a referral service for

veterans, partners with Kelly Services Inc. to provide jobs for recently discharged military personnel. Veterans often have difficulty finding work despite their skills, says retired Marine Major Gen. Matthew Caulfield, Hire Quality's chief executive.

"They can't network," says Mr. Caulfield, who helped found the Chicago-based company three years ago. "You're not reading the classifieds when you're aboard a ship in the Adriatic." About 275,000 people leave the armed forces for the private sector every year. Still, not every veteran faces a tough job search: The Air Force last week said it expects to be 835 pilots short of its required 14,000 this year due to pilots' leaving for commercial carriers.

DNA testing era could bring demise of military tradition

USA Today
April 28, 1998
Pg. 6

By Andrea Stone
USA TODAY

ARLINGTON, Va. — When the nation wanted to honor those who lost their lives as well as their identities during World War I, there was an army to choose from.

But DNA testing could signal an end to this military tradition. On Monday, a Pentagon panel recommended that the remains of a Vietnam war serviceman be exhumed from the Tomb of the Unknowns to determine through the tests whether his identity can be determined.

"We may have gotten to the point where technology is thankfully making this custom unnecessary," Phil Budahn of the American Legion says.

The Vietnam serviceman rests in a plaza in front of the World War I unknown and between those from World War II and the Korean War.

Their shrine is among the most visited sites at Arlington National Cemetery, which receives 4.5 million visitors annually. It is guarded 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Members of the Army's elite 3rd Infantry Old Guard unit patrol in one-hour shifts. Each sentry takes 21 steps, turns with clicked heels to face the tomb for 21 seconds, then marches back 21 steps. The highly choreographed ritual represents a 21-gun salute.

After World War I, more than 1,600 American remains were unidentified. And on Armistice Day, Nov. 11, 1921, President Warren Harding looked on as the unknown's casket was placed in a steel vault inside the nearly 80-ton, white marble tomb.

Inscribed upon the sarcophagus: "Here Rests in Honored Glory an American Soldier Known But to God."

In 1958, the unknowns of World War II and the Korean War were interred. They also had been selected from many. World War II had left 8,500 unknowns; Korea, 850.

In 1973, Congress authorized enshrining a casualty from the Vietnam War. A crypt was excavated two years later. It lay empty for nearly a decade.

The changing nature of battle had made it difficult to designate any remains as "unidentifiable." In earlier wars, the dead might lay unattended for weeks. In Vietnam, casualties were often evacuated as the battle raged. In World War II, many who died were shattered by artillery shells or grenades. In Vietnam, many were killed by gunfire.

Advances in forensic science and military medical recordkeeping also aided identification in Vietnam.

By 1982, there were only four unknown remains in the Army's Central Identification Laboratory in Hawaii. One of them, designated X-26, now lies in the Tomb.

Until 1980, X-26 had been "believed to be" Michael Blassie because they had been found with his identification card, which later disappeared. But forensics experts said the remains did not match Blassie's blood type and height. So the designation was dropped, and the remains were listed as unidentified.

In 1984, amid growing pressure from veterans to honor Vietnam's unknowns, the Reagan administration chose X-26 for the tomb. President Reagan said at the funeral, "About him we may well wonder, as others have, as a child, did he play on some street in a great American city? Did he work beside his father on a farm in America's heartland?

"We will never know the answers to these questions about his life."

Now, we may.

Washington Post April 28, 1998 Pg. 4

Submarine Named After Carter

The Navy named its newest and most fearsome submarine the USS Jimmy Carter, honoring a former submariner who became the 39th president of the United States.

With a grin, the honoree said: "If I had a choice between a submarine and an airport, I would choose a submarine." Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport was recently named for the nation's 40th president, who upset Carter's bid for reelection.

The 353-foot Jimmy Carter, also to be known as the SNN 23, is under construction and is scheduled to join the fleet in 2001.

Clinton Honors Israel, Urges Peace

President Clinton marked the 50th anniversary of the Israeli state with a White House ceremony yesterday where he renewed his plea for peace in the Middle East, calling it the only guarantee for the long-term stability of the young nation.

Clinton hosted hundreds of prominent Israelis and Jewish Americans for the South Lawn event that also featured dramatic readings by actors Richard Dreyfuss and Linda Lavin. Clinton said Israel's founders had succeeded in establishing a prosperous and democratic nation that has "dazzled the world" with artistic and scientific achievements. But it must still strive to build the lasting peace it sought from the beginning, he said.

"We cannot let the extremists prevail," Clinton said. "Israel can fulfill its full promise by drawing on the courage and vision of its founders to achieve peace with security. Never has the opportunity been more real and it must not be lost."

Washington Post April 28, 1998 Pg. 17

A Go for NATO

By Robert B. Zoellick

This week the Senate will decide whether to enlarge NATO to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. This choice is a strategic one for the future, exactly the type of determination the United States should be making at this point in history. With the end of the long era of the Cold War and amid today's peace and prosperity, the United States should be using its unparalleled strength to shape the structure of international relations for decades to come. NATO's enlargement is a wise investment that promotes both America's security interests and its democratic values.

Even before the collapse of the Soviet Union, NATO had evolved into a unique alliance. The original defense commitment was always complemented by a political compact among countries that treasured their freedom. Over time, this partnership became a vehicle for promoting common transatlantic interests and ideas. Today NATO is both an alliance of democracies and a valuable integrated military organization. It is the primary channel through which the United States influences the politics and security of Europe. And NATO offers forward bases for U.S. forces that may need to deploy to other quarters, including the troubled Persian Gulf and Middle East.

A vote for NATO's enlargement will help the United States prepare for the future in three ways. First, the United States has a strong interest in consolidating the security of and democracy in Central and Eastern Europe. With the unification of Germany, Europe's center of political gravity has shifted east. For centuries, these lands have been the fields of contest among large neighboring powers, especially Germany and Russia.

It is time to end this tragic history. The way to do so is by securing the young Polish, Hungarian and Czech democracies within the frameworks of NATO and the European Union. Together these compacts have enabled Western Europe to reconcile old animosities, protect the peace, build prosperity and promote higher aspirations. Central and Eastern Europe should no longer be the borderland within some power's sphere of influence; the region should be an equal and contributing part of a larger transatlantic community.

Second, the Poles, Czechs and Hungarians will be good partners for the United States and NATO in dealing with the next generation of problems. They know the value of freedom, recognize that the price of security is vigilance and appreciate that America's power and friendship are vital for freedom and security.

Over time, Polish, Hungarian and Czech troops, resources and ideas will strengthen NATO's capabilities. I suspect they will also be among the most ready European partners to help the United States, and even NATO, to address new missions, whether to protect energy security in the gulf or to counter the threats of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. Indeed, one U.S. colonel, who will be part of the next generation of senior officers, said recently that before long he expected to count more on steady Polish brigades than ambivalent French friends.

Finally, by incorporating these three countries into NATO and building their confidence in a secure future, the United States will be strengthening the shoulder from which it can reach out to those farther east, including Russia. No one can say for certain what course Russia will follow, or even what will happen after Boris Yeltsin passes from the stage. Some of those competing to succeed Yeltsin -- for example, Moscow's Mayor Luzhkov -- have tried to bully Russia's western neighbors. So it is no wonder that the new democracies want the firm security NATO provides. It would be a grave mistake to concede to the demands of old Soviets now parading as new Russians. Russia's leaders can be counted upon to make their calculations based on assessments of Russia's interests, and of America's strength.

Yet it would also be a mistake to ignore the possibilities of cooperating with Russia and the potential of a truly democratic Russia. To succeed in building a new Russia, however, the Russians must decide whether they will embrace the logic of the 21st century or persist with the perspectives of the 19th century. In that earlier age, powerful countries preferred weak neighbors that they could dominate. Today, as the United States and the European Union have learned, troubled neighbors are a liability, not an advantage. They may contribute to economic and environmental problems, political instability, disruptive immigration, transnational crime and narco-trafficking, perhaps exacerbated by terrorist possibilities.

Russians know that Poland and a democratic NATO pose no threat, as some recent polls have shown. In fact, Russia will be better off if Central and Eastern Europe are stable, prosperous and confident enough in their own security to work with Russia. The real questions for a new generation in Russia are whether the country will abandon its imperial past, concentrate on building democracy and free markets domestically and accept the opportunity for cooperation offered by the United States and NATO.

The decision to admit Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic into NATO is based on a strategic logic. This vote is about America's plan for shaping the future of Europe within a transatlantic relationship. NATO's enlargement secures the heart of Europe while strengthening America's influence and promoting its values. It gives the United States and Europe a stronger foundation from which to assist the Baltic states, Ukraine and Russia. It gives NATO new members that will contribute to America's broader security interests and their own well-being. It is the right choice.

The writer was an undersecretary of state and White House deputy chief of staff in the Bush administration.

New York Times April 28, 1998

Foreign Affairs / By Thomas L. Friedman

Ben & Jerry & NATO

Ben Cohen, head of Ben & Jerry's ice cream, is struggling for the right analogy: If NATO expansion against a newly democratic Russia were like the ice cream biz, what would it be?

"I think I've got it," says Ben. "Our biggest competitor is Häagen-Dazs. So it would be as if one day Häagen-Dazs announced that after all these years of competing with us, it had decided to go out of the ice cream business and instead would sell only hot dogs. And then one day Häagen-Dazs Hot Dogs comes to Ben & Jerry's and says, 'We would like to be partners with you and sell your ice cream in our hot dog shops.' But we said to them, 'No, we won't let you sell our ice cream. We still want to drive Häagen-Dazs out of business, even though you're not in the ice cream business anymore, because we remember you were once in the ice cream business. And furthermore, we're going to spend $2 billion to kill your hot dog business to make sure you'll never sell ice cream again.' "

Well, you get the point. NATO expansion is about not knowing when the war is over and how to consolidate your gains. Now you might ask what Ben of Ben & Jerry's knows about such things and why he is buying newspaper ads opposing NATO expansion, on the eve of the Senate vote.

The answer is that Mr. Cohen is not an expert in foreign policy, but that makes him perfect for the NATO debate, because it hasn't been about foreign policy. It's been about politics -- the Clinton team's desire to win Eastern European ethnic votes. It's been about marketing -- the biggest lobby for NATO expansion is U.S. arms sellers. And it's been

about nostalgia -- the nostalgia of the conservative right for the Soviet Union and the clarity of the cold war.

The one thing it has not been about is what Mr. Cohen is an expert in: what's good for America. And as the founder of Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities, a coalition of 400 executives concerned about the future of U.S. schools and cities, Mr. Cohen is asking the only relevant question: Why would the U.S. expand a cold-war alliance against a democratic Russia that wants to be part of Western Europe, when those resources and energies could be used at home and abroad so much more productively? "It's crazy," he says.

But NATO expansion isn't just dumb. It's dangerous -- because fighting the last war is only going to make it harder to win the next one. What are the threats to U.S. security today? They are Russia's loosely controlled nukes, missile proliferation, terrorism, rogue states like Iraq, and global organized crime (especially Russian). The U.S. cannot effectively deal with these problems without a cooperative Russia. Therefore, there is only one relevant test for NATO expansion: Will it help or hinder U.S.-Russian cooperation on America's post-cold-war agenda?

It will absolutely hinder.

NATO expansion will exacerbate America's security problems in Europe -- because just bringing Poland, Hungary and the Czechs into NATO is going to draw a new dividing line in Europe, and bringing all Central and Eastern Europeans into NATO, including the Balts, will only rekindle the cold war and prompt Russia to rely even more on nuclear weapons for its defense.

Oh, but you don't understand Russia, the NATO expanders say. It's as much a bear as the Soviet Union. It will reoccupy Eastern Europe as soon as it's strong enough. Maybe. But so far the Russians have peacefully withdrawn their troops from Eastern Europe, abandoned Communism, established democratic rule, disbanded the Soviet Union and agreed to conventional and nuclear arms reduction treaties, in which they gave up much more than we did.

That's why those cold-war hard-liners who actually know Russian history, politics and culture -- like Ronald Reagan's Ambassador to Moscow, Jack Matlock, or the Harvard historian Richard Pipes -- are against NATO expansion. They know that if Russia should turn into a bear again, there's ample time to deter it. But in the meantime we maximize America's post-cold-war interests by trying to nurture the reforming Russia, the one before our eyes, rather than treating it like the Soviet Union in drag, and inevitably restricting future cooperation on what matters to us. As Mr. Cohen would put it, opposing NATO expansion is not about being sensitive to Russia's feelings, but about being sensitive to U.S. interests.

Ah, but what does the ice cream man know about foreign policy?

Wall Street Journal April 28, 1998

Time to End Iran's Russian Connection

By Kenneth R. Timmerman

Last Thursday U.S. envoy Robert Gallucci concluded three days of talks with Russian officials in Moscow on the participation of Russian companies and scientists in Iran's ballistic missile programs. Russia has consistently denied that it is helping Iran build a missile capable of launching a nuclear warhead against Israel.

But there is little reason to have confidence in such assurances. The latest case involves a Russian shipment of 22 tons of special steel alloys, which U.S. officials believe was to be used in making fuel tanks for the new Iranian missiles, known as Shahab-3. Although U.S. officials notified the Russian government that the shipment was about the leave Moscow for Iran, the Russians failed to stop it. On March 26 customs officers in Azerbaijan finally stopped the truck just before it crossed the border into Iran. The Russians complained they didn't have enough information to stop the shipment themselves.

This is part of a pattern. Vice President Al Gore first demanded an explanation of the troubling reports of Russian assistance to the Iranian missile program in February 1996. Then-Premier Viktor Chernomyrdin feigned ignorance and promised answers. After four months of dithering, he complained that the information Mr. Gore had provided him was too vague.

In the meantime, Russian assistance to the Iranian missile programs accelerated and went underground, according to Israeli and U.S. intelligence sources I interviewed during a lengthy investigation for the January issue of Reader's Digest. "Whenever Gore provides more information to Chernomyrdin about the missile programs, we see the Russians seeking to identify the sources of that information and close them off," Gen. David Ivry, a senior official of the Israeli Ministry of Defense, told me in Tel Aviv. Companies the Israelis had identified would disappear, and new, unknown ones take their place--a shell game aimed to disguise Moscow's cooperation with Tehran.

Incredibly, some of the same companies that have been helping the Iranians build their new missiles are also receiving subsidies from U.S. taxpayers. Sens. Trent Lott (R., Miss.) and Joseph Lieberman (D., Conn.) have introduced legislation to punish foreign companies and governments transferring missile technology to Iran. The Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act would bar the guilty parties--companies that help Iran with its missile program and governments that fail to act against them--from participating in U.S. government-funded programs and from purchasing sophisticated U.S. technology. "This legislation is necessary because the Clinton-Gore administration has not done enough to address the threat posed by Iranian missile development," Mr. Lott said. The bill has passed the House and has 82 co-sponsors in the Senate. Mr. Lott, the majority leader, has scheduled a vote on it next month.

The administration's response to the threat of legislation was to appoint a special envoy to engage the Russians in more talks. Frank Wisner, a former ambassador to India, was selected for this task last July. By the time he left the government last month, the list of Russian entities suspected of transferring critical missile technologies to Iran had grown from a handful to more than 20. People who attended classified briefings by Mr. Wisner said that he tried to "paper over" Moscow's involvement in the transfers, "flying in the face of hard intelligence" provided by the CIA. Clearly, the administration goal was simply to prevent the sanctions bill from becoming law.

Since leaving government, Mr. Wisner has taken a top job at the American International Group, which last year launched the largest private investment fund in the former Soviet Union. AIG's $300 million Millennium Fund was made possible by U.S. government guarantees provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corp.--funding that would be banned if the Lott-Lieberman legislation becomes law. Russian officials tell me Mr. Wisner was a favorite in Moscow and had a reputation for offering incentives to Russia in exchange for promises of better behavior. His last offer, made shortly before he retired in early March, was to expand Russian participation in joint space projects, deals that already have cost the U.S. taxpayer more than $400 million and that would be canceled under the Lott-Lieberman bill.

Russia's behavior during these lengthy negotiations has been unbecoming of a nation that the administration likes to call a "partner" in promoting world peace. Instead of cutting off Iranian access to scientists with special knowledge in ballistic missile design and to research institutes and manufacturing plants, the Russian government appears simply to have tried to disguise the contacts

better.

Last November, for instance, Moscow announced with great fanfare that it had arrested and expelled a 32-year-old Iranian, Reza Teymouri, for having attempted to purchase missile plans from a Russian design bureau. Iranian sources said Mr. Teymouri was a full-time intelligence agent who was in charge of the Iranian missile procurement effort in Russia, so his expulsion--if true--was significant. But it remains unclear whether Mr. Teymouri was actually deported to Iran, as the Russians claim, or was merely admonished to be more discreet. In other cases, Iranians working on missile plans while enrolled at specialized aerospace institutes in Russia were required to change to nontechnical fields of study.

At the same time Russia was making these gestures, teams of top Russian scientists continued visiting Tehran to help the Iranians design and build the Shahab-3 missile, which will have a range of 800 miles. On March 16 a Moscow newspaper, Novaya Gazeta, revealed that the Russian Security Service, known by its Russian acronym FSB, was facilitating the travel of Russian scientists to Iran. This was necessary, the paper said, because under Russian law top scientists who have access to classified information may not apply for passports to travel abroad. To get around this restriction, the FSB provided the passports and arranged for two-year contracts for the scientists to work in Iran. Russian officials have dismissed the paper's investigation as "exaggeration."

One destination of the Russian scientists was a test site in the desert just east of Tehran, run by the Shahid Hemat Industrial Group, where they helped the Iranians test a rocket motor that was based on a Russian design. An Israeli intelligence official told the Knesset last week that Iran has nearly completed development of the Shahab-3 motor and can be expected to start producing the missile sometime next year. This would threaten not only Israel but also other U.S. allies, including Turkey, as well as U.S. troops stationed in Saudi Arabia.

Russia's ties to Iran clearly run counter to U.S. national interests. Yet top Clinton administration officials--starting with Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, who was also in Moscow last week--have repeatedly found excuses for Russia's misbehavior. Mr. Talbott went to Moscow with yet another political sweetener--a summit meeting with President Clinton to be held next month. He should have told the Russians there would be no more meetings until they had cut off aid to the Iranian missile program--period. The time for offering the Russians incentives is long over.

Given the administration's behavior, the Russian government has understandably concluded that Washington is not overly concerned by the missile transfers to Iran. Given the threat Iranian missiles pose to U.S. national security, it is crucial that Congress act to dispel this misperception.

Mr. Timmerman is an investigative reporter for the Reader's Digest and publisher of a monthly newsletter, The Iran Brief.

Chicago Tribune April 27, 1998

Stifle Latin Arms Purchases

Military expenditures, costly, unnecessary and dangerous, are increasing sharply in Latin America. The United States is the only country with enough clout to try to slow down this trend, yet it is instead shamelessly abetting it.

Such a slowdown was not even on the agenda of the recent Summit of the Americas in Santiago, Chile. On the contrary, President Clinton arrived two days early for what was widely perceived as a bit of private schmoozing of Chilean president Eduardo Frei, who is pondering the purchase of $600 million of advanced American F-16s. A few days before, the U.S. ambassador had been quoted in Santiago's newspapers in a crass sales pitch that touted the U.S.-made planes--as if they were toasters--as better and cheaper than those from Sweden and France.

This is a trend that feeds on itself and leads nowhere: Ask a Chilean official why the country needs new planes, and he'll mention Peru's purchases last year--which is the same reason Ecuadorian officials would give. And if Peru, Chile and Ecuador are buying, can Brazil be far behind?

The aircraft deal is part of a $1.5 billion Chilean shopping spree that includes 300 French and German tanks, two submarines and other military knickknacks. It follows Peru's purchase in 1997 of two additional submarines--it already has six--and 18 MiG-29 fighters and 18 Su-27 bombers from Belarus. Naturally, neighboring Ecuador now wants to buy its own planes, and Brazil recently announced that it is eyeing 100 late-model planes for a deal that could reach $3 billion.

During the past two decades Latin America has emerged from a dark period of military dictatorships and other abuses, but it's still an uneasy truce. Even in prosperous Chile, the military sector is still formidable and not shy about muttering threats to the civilian administration. A military coup was threatened in Paraguay in 1996 and also in Peru late last year. Latin military sectors need to be slimmed down rather than fed.

There is no conceivable external threat that could justify a poor country like Peru spending hundreds of millions of dollars assembling squadrons of submarines and MiGs. If there's a security threat, it is internal and fueled by the widespread poverty. Indeed, shortly after the Belarus jets arrived, leftist guerrillas--thought to have been long out of business--took over the Japanese ambassador's home, creating a political crisis from which President Alberto Fujimori has yet to recover.

Although U.S. defense contractors get an immediate boost from such arms sales, there are no long-term benefits for either side. Latin America still has huge infrastructure needs--physical and human--in the areas of transportation, public health and education. Attending to those multibillion-dollar needs would benefit the U.S., too, by lifting standards of living and increasing markets for American-made products.

The U.S. should promote short-term regional moratoriums on purchases of advanced military equipment, leading up to more permanent conventions that would establish numerical and technological ceilings on armaments. This is the only rational option for U.S. policymakers--and certainly the only one that would reinforce rather than undermine Latin America's move toward democratic and economic freedom and stability.

Baltimore Sun April 28, 1998 Pg. 2C

Lockheed unit awaits missile contract worth up to $400 million

Lockheed Martin Corp.'s Vought Systems division expects the U.S. Army to approve this week a contract worth as much as $400 million for a new generation of long-range tactical missiles, officials said yesterday.

The U.S. Army Missile Command will award the first installment by April 30, spokesman Dan O'Boyle said. The action will mean additional sales for the Dallas, Texas, division through 2001, said Army and company officials. The contractor team includes Honeywell Defense Systems Inc., Atlantic Research Corp. and Alliant Techsystems Inc.

The missile system cleared a major hurdle last week when the Defense Department testing office told Congress that the system was cleared for full production.

Washington Times
Apr. 28, 1998 Pg. 21

FRANK GAFFNEY JR.

Biological warfare warning

Mr. President:

Sunday's New York Times reveals you have become personally seized with the nation's vulnerability to biological warfare. If that is the case, you have the potential to create a legacy that could be as profound and positive as any of your presidency. But to do so, you must take care to grasp the true magnitude of the problem and to avoid counterproductive actions.

According to the Times' report, your concerns about bioterrorism have been catalyzed by Richard Preston's novel "The Cobra Event" and by a recent, secret interagency exercise in which a bioterrorist attack was simulated. In both, terrorists use a genetically engineered viruses to inflict mass casualties and to sow mayhem on American society.

You evidently were particularly, and properly, alarmed by the conclusion of the civilian "war-game." As the New York Times put it: "The United States, despite huge investments of time, money and effort in recent years, is still unprepared to respond to biological terror weapons." The game showed state, local and federal government representatives were quickly overwhelmed and found themselves at odds over how to deal with the resulting catastrophe — and whose responsibility it was to do so.

As a result, you are now said to be preparing two Presidential Decision Directives (PDDs) aimed: (1) at putting the country on a better footing to prevent biological, chemical or computer attacks on its people or infrastructure and (2) if all else fails and they occur, to mitigate their effects. To maximize the benefit of these PDDs, I would respectfully urge that you consider two points:

First, the problem with which you are now grappling — namely, the United States' dangerous susceptibility to biological weapons attack — is, of course, just one manifestation of a much larger problem. This is what might be called our posture of "assured vulnerability."

Ever since 1972, when President Nixon signed the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with the Soviet Union, it has been the policy of the U.S. government to leave its people deliberately exposed to destruction by missile-delivered nuclear weapons. Having done so in a world in which the Soviet Union had a virtual monopoly on such a threat, the idea gradually took hold that it made no sense to invest the vast sums required to protect Americans against Soviet bomber-delivered weapons, either. If there would be no defenses against these delivery systems, it seemed unnecessary (not to say virtually impossible) to mitigate the effects on the population of the weapons they carried. So civil defense went over the side, as well.

Thus, the vulnerability you are now concerned with, is a direct by-product of the inexorable, if bizarre, logic that says keeping America at risk of assured destruction is a good thing and defenses that might prevent, or at least mitigate, such destruction are bad things. If you are committed meaningfully to rectifying our present posture, you must also correct its intellectual underpinnings.

Unfortunately, until now, your administration has adamantly insisted it is committed to perpetuating the ABM Treaty. If this policy were to persist, you would be seriously compromising your new PDDs by addressing attacks with biological weapons if they are made possible by suitcase bombs, aerosol trucks or Cessna crop-dusters, but not if they come via ballistic missile.

The folly of such an approach was laid bare in the course of testimony provided last week by Mr. Preston before a Senate hearing chaired by Sen. Jon Kyl, Arizona Republican. The best-selling author of "The Cobra Event" and "The Hot Zone" declared Russia may have as many as 800 intercontinental range ballistic missiles aimed at the United States and armed with smallpox or other viruses (including, perhaps, genetically engineered biological "cocktails").

Surely you appreciate that, even if the former Soviet Union's own missile and biological weapons programs were not cause for grave concern, missile, biological weapons and other WMD-relevant technology are turning up in other, potentially unfriendly hands. For example, yesterday, it was revealed that the Russians are assisting Indian efforts to develop a submarine-launched missile system. Saturday, it was disclosed that Russia nearly succeeded in smuggling specialty steel suitable for missile bodies to Iran. And China is known to have supplied missile technology to, among others, Pakistan, Iraq and North Korea.

Each of these countries is believed to have weapons of mass destruction programs. The absence of effective U.S. global missile defenses merely serves as an incentive to fit such weapons on missiles of ever-increasing capability, whether to threaten regional foes or Americans and their interests. It makes no sense to try to close the back door to bioterrorism while leaving the front door open.

In addition to including comprehensive missile defenses in your WMD vulnerability-reduction program — the fastest, simplest and cheapest way to do this is by adapting the Navy's AEGIS fleet air defense system to allow it to shoot down long- and shorter-range ballistic missiles, as well aircraft and cruise missiles — there is something you should not do:

Under no circumstances should the U.S. government endanger, if not preclude, the cooperation its efforts to counter the threat of biological weapons must enjoy with the biotech and related industries. Your first director of central intelligence, R. James Woolsey, warns that: "One way I think we could destroy the possibility of having that kind of partnership is to move toward some ineffective and very intrusive notion of how to verify the Biological Weapons Convention. Trying to have a verification regime that would on a routine basis go into pharmaceutical facilities and look at them would really only penalize the people who are . . . behaving themselves and staying within the law. . . . You're not going to find what Hezbollah is doing with biological weapons that way or, for that matter, a Unabomber, who thinks about using biologicals instead of explosives in packages."

Mr. President, if you are serious about ending our nation's posture of assured vulnerability — which will be readily apparent if you promptly begin deploying effective anti-missile systems and eschew counterproductive arms control ideas —you will enjoy the support, and enduring appreciation, of every American.

Frank J. Gaffney Jr. is the director of the Center for Security Policy and a columnist for The Washington Times.

New York Times
April 28, 1998

In Case Germ War Breaks Out Someday

To the Editor:

Richard Preston (Op-Ed, April 21) properly worries that

many doctors would not know how to treat victims of a biological weapon like anthrax or smallpox. This concern was underscored by an April 26 front-page article, "Exercise Finds U.S. Unable to Handle Germ War Threat."

Contrary to Mr. Preston's suggestion, however, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is not "largely uninvolved" in the "planning loop" to address a bioattack. In cooperation with other Federal and local agencies, the C.D.C. has sponsored forums, planned coordinated responses and participated in emergency drills in several cities, including New York.

LEONARD A. COLE
Newark, April 26, 1998

The writer is an adjunct professor of political science at Rutgers University.

To the Editor:

Richard Preston (Op-Ed, April 21) recommends that a World Wide Web site be developed to provide medical advice to doctors about potential bioweapons like anthrax and smallpox. That site is a reality.

In 1996 the Army Office of the Surgeon General opened the Medical Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defense Training and Education Network at http://www.nbc-med.org/. The site provides medical information to anyone in the military or civilian health care communities. It includes Army field manuals, information papers, fact sheets, and Government and commercial publications. While it does not yet offer training modules, the goal is to provide an interactive training and reference tool.

(Lieut. Gen.) RONALD R. BLANCK
U.S. Army Surgeon General
Falls Church, Va., April 22, 1998

Editor's Note: The op-ed referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 21, 1998, Pg. 14.

Women are serving proudly in the U.S. Navy

Washington Times
April 28, 1998
Pg. 22

Paul Craig Roberts' commentary in the April 24 edition of The Washington Times contains errors and half-truths ("Military tailspin over sexual politics"). I feel compelled to respond.

I take particular exception to the inaccurate comparisons that Mr. Roberts draws between Lt. Patrick J. Burns and retired Adm. Stan Arthur. Adm. Arthur is a combat veteran and a war hero. He flew successful combat missions in Vietnam, worked his way up through the highest levels of the U.S. Navy, led the Navy's efforts in Desert Shield and Desert Storm and was the second-in-command of the world's best Navy during very trying times. Adm. Arthur was an officer of the highest integrity in whom I continue to have complete confidence. He would never put his name to any document that he didn't believe was the absolute truth. And he is a sterling example of our core values of honor, courage and commitment. Lt. Burns broke the law and did not uphold our core values. For that, I took the appropriate administrative action —plain and simple.

I am proud of the way our Navy has gone about the integration of women. Since the secretary of defense opened combat aviation to women five years ago this month, we have made many changes in the way we do business. These changes allow women (who make up more than 51 percent of the U.S. population) to contribute more than ever before to our nation's defense.

Women are serving proudly in all vessels except submarines, mine-warfare craft and coastal-patrol craft; they serve in 91 of 94 enlisted skill ratings; they pilot all types of aircraft; five women will take command of combat ships this year; they serve as Seabees, lawyers, mechanics, doctors — in short, in all career fields in which they are eligible to serve. This is the right thing to do, and I intend to keep doing it. Mr. Roberts' comments are an insult to women so proudly serving in our armed forces.

I had an editorial board meeting with The Times three years ago this month, in which we discussed at length the particulars surrounding the tragic death of Lt. Kara Hultgreen. I readily acknowledged then and acknowledge now that her accident was a combination of pilot error and mechanical failure. I was quoted on the front page of the April 13, 1995, edition of The Times ("Pilot error acknowledged") as follows:

"Indeed, there was an engine failure, and we have shown on the tape where [Lt. Hultgreen] clearly overshot when she was making the approach and she was trying to correct when the engine did go out. It was the combination of those things that led to her accident and her death."

I issued no "false report" citing engine failure as the sole cause of the accident. Mr. Roberts should check his own paper's records before he writes. Your readers deserve better.

JOHN H. DALTON
Secretary
Department of the Navy
Washington

Editor's Note: The commentary referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 24, 1998, Pg. 12.

Washington Times April 27, 1998 Pg. 18

The U.N. Is Fresh Out Of Black Helicopters

Your April 23 front-page article, "White House backs standby U.N. army," reminds us of individuals who mistakenly claim that the United Nations has a fleet of black helicopters at its disposal ready to spy on unsuspecting Americans. It is that wrong. Make no mistake, there is no standing U.N. army nor is there a "command unit" at the United Nations waiting to direct these imaginary troops. So what is there and what are the facts?

After years of criticism-by U.S. Republican and Democratic administrations - leveled at the United Nations for failure to engage member nations' troops and material fast enough to prevent death and destruction, the United Nations created a Standby-Arrangements System (SBAS). The SBAS is nothing more than a bank of file drawers with information on what 70 odd nations, including the United States, may be able to offer to a peacekeeping operation. If the U.N: Security Council approves an operation, U.N. staff members go to the file drawers, figure out what they need and ask each nation if it can provide the troops and material. The United Nations has this system because it knows that it would probably never have any troops or material permanently at its disposal to rapidly respond to an outbreak of conflict.

To answer further criticism about the speed with which the United Nations and its member nations respond to conflict, the United Nations proposed to create a Rapidly Deployable Mission Headquarters (RDMHQ). The RDMHQ is nothing more than an experienced group of military and civilian officials who can move quickly to the scene of conflict alter approval by the Security Council. They can then plan the mission and perform the principal staff functions of headquarters personnel that in the past took three to six months to organize.

Indeed, the eight persons your article refers to are simply the initial staff. Although they

are stationed at the United Nations and train together to plan a mission, the group does not contain any commanders of a potential operation. Commanders are chosen as they have been for decades. Member nation troops are never under U.N. command; they are under the command of their home country. So the RDMHQ is hardly a command unit.

The erroneous information in your article only supports those who see "black helicopters" and "U.N. spies." In the final analysis, the United States belongs to and leads the United Nations because it is in our nation's national security interest.

D.F. Davis
Senior fellow
Program on Peacekeeping Policy
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Beth C. Degrasse
Director
Project on Peacekeeping and the U.N. Council for a Livable World Education Fund
Washington

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the *Current News Earlybird,* April 23, 1998, Pg. 3

Washington Times April 25, 1998 Pg. C2

If officers receive involuntary separation pay, so should enlisted men

Regarding your April 21 front-page article "Good soldiers don't get exit benefits of misfits":

The Non Commissioned Officers Association of the United States of America (NCOA) is extremely concerned about the recent attacks on certain separation pay for members of the armed forces who are involuntarily discharged.

The payment of involuntary-separation pay to enlisted members was a major legislative goal for NCOA and became a major victory for the association in 1991 when Congress passed the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal 1992.

The matter was one of enlisted/ officer equity, since officers who were involuntarily separated from the military services received separation pay, while enlisted members received nothing. The involuntary-separation pay also helped military members make the transition to civilian life when the terms of military service were cut short unexpectedly. If officers had not been treated differently from enlisted people, there would have been no issue to correct.

Voluntary-separation pay, on the other hand, was devised by the Defense Department - and eventually enacted by Congress - to assist Defense in meeting its force-reduction goals. It was supplemented by additional benefits -such as housing, medical care, commissary/exchange privileges and household-goods storage as further enticements to leave the service.

NCOA is not aware that any supplemental benefit beyond monetary payment is extended to those who are involuntarily separated from the military. In this regard, NCOA believes that attempts to compare the two separate pay categories by portraying them incorrectly are altogether wrong.

Michael F. Ouellette
Sgt. Maj., U.S. Army (retired)
Director of legislative affairs
Non Commissioned Officers Association of the United States of America
Alexandria

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird,* April 21, 1998, Pg. 2.

Washington Post April 26, 1998 Pg. C6

Our Growing Nuclear Stockpile

In his April 2 news story, "Lab to Make More Triggers for H-Bombs," Walter Pincus reprints the Department of Energy's stated reasons for resuming manufacture of plutonium pits ("triggers"): to ensure the "reliability" of the nuclear stockpile and to "prepare a reserve supply." But Mr. Pincus fails to mention that the United States already has a reserve supply of approximately 12,000 plutonium pits -- already tested and certified -- many of which can be reused if needed. According to DOE and Los Alamos managers, none of these pits has become less reliable with time and will not do so for decades to come.

With its current equipment, Los Alamos can manufacture 10 to 20 new pits per year. To increase this rate to 50 pits per year would cost well in excess of $1 billion, according to DOE's estimate. Worse, this billion-dollar project is described by DOE as merely a "demonstration module" for a facility six to 10 times larger. This year's budget request includes a down payment of $67 million on this unnecessary and dangerous endeavor, the estimated costs of which already have more than tripled.

Those of us who have studied DOE's "stockpile stewardship" program hope that someone in Congress wakes up before signing off on this enormous folly.

Maya Sinha
Santa Fe, N.M.

The writer is a researcher at the Los Alamos Study Group, a disarmament and nuclear weapons policy research group.

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird,* April 2, 1998, Pg. 7.

Washington Post April 28, 1998 Pg. 16

Hands Off the Drug Lords

The editorial on providing helicopters to Colombia ["Shrinking Colombia," April 15] raised but did not address two major contradictions in Clinton administration foreign policy.

President Clinton wants to keep U.S. troops in Bosnia for an indefinite period despite the fact that no Bosnian faction presents the slightest threat to Americans. Yet he wants to avoid any action against Colombian drug gangs whose campaign to poison millions of Americans is a direct assault on our society.

No enemy has ever inflicted as much damage on this nation as have the international drug lords. They should be treated like any other foreign aggressor.

The editorial said that part of the reluctance to do so is because of human rights abuses by the Colombian military. Yet in regard to China, Vietnam and various African regimes, the president has rejected human rights concerns to support far less vital private commercial interests. His sudden desire for clean hands in a war against some of the most vicious thugs on the planet is inconsistent and unrealistic.

On both counts, the administration needs to explain its failure to act as the body count mounts in our own streets.

WILLIAM R. HAWKINS
Burke

Editor's Note: The editorial referred to appeared in the *Current News Earlybird,* April 15, 1998, Pg. 10.

Philadelphia Inquirer April 28, 1998 Pg. 6

Pentagon hackers did no harm, experts say

By Chris Allbritton
ASSOCIATED PRESS

NEW YORK — Hackers who broke into Pentagon computers and bragged that they had stolen the means to cripple the military's communications network instead took publicly available software that is almost worthless without the data to run it, said security consultants and the Defense Department.

Security experts around the world scoffed yesterday at the allegations made by a hacker group calling itself "Masters of Downloading."

"They may have gotten what they say they got," said Aaron Bornstein, a freelance computer security consultant in New York. "But what they claim they could do with it is ridiculous."

Last week, the group's 15 hackers said they broke into computers at the Defense Information Systems Agency and stole software. The program, they said, controls the military's Global Positioning System of satellites that are used to target missiles and coordinate troop movements.

The group maintained that it could shut down the military's networks with the stolen software, and threatened to sell it to terrorist groups or foreign governments.

The pilfered software is not classified and does not allow access to classified data, said Pentagon spokeswoman Susan Hansen. She said the software was useless without classified data.

Supporting Hansen's assertions, Bornstein gave the Associated Press a link to the software available to anyone with a Web browser. The Masters of Downloading "are just trying to scare people," the consultant said.

Another consultant, Shimon Gruper, a former Israeli army security expert, said he was confident that the group had not stolen anything dangerous.

Other governments' top secret computers, he said, are not connected to the Internet or other public networks. "And," he said, "I'm sure the U.S. government is the same" — an assertion the Pentagon spokeswoman confirmed.

European Stars & Stripes April 28, 1998 Pg. 5

School of Americas softening its image

FORT BENNING, Ga. (AP) — Weary of being portrayed as a training ground for assassins, the Army's controversial School of the Americas in west Georgia is trying to spruce up its image.

Just days before more than 500 people converged in front of the White House calling for the school's closing, the school for Latin American military officers invited journalists from a dozen news organizations around the world to participate in its first-ever "media day."

It was a chance, school officials said, to show reporters its programs and provide a more positive spin on the facility, which has been the target of protesters and a move to cut off congressional funding.

"I think it went very well. It gave us an opportunity to tell the truth about all the wild accusations that surround the school," Col. Roy Trumble, the commandant of the school based at Fort Benning near Columbus, said Sunday.

The school, which moved from Panama to Fort Benning in 1984, trains soldiers and police officers in military subjects ranging from basic marksmanship to mine removal.

Last Friday, reporters were given a tour of the school and were allowed to briefly sit in on some classes, which are all conducted in Spanish.

The journalists remained skeptical, however.

"They were teaching war tactics. During a war, all the resources you have, you use them. You don't say to someone you're interrogating, 'Come on, talk to us, and we'll give you a cheeseburger and a Coke,' " said Mario Andrada Esilva, a reporter from the CBS television network in Brazil.

Baltimore Sun April 28, 1998 Pg. C1

GEC offers to purchase Lockheed, Northrop units

Britain's General Electric Co. PLC said yesterday that it made an informal offer to buy the defense electronics businesses that Lockheed Martin Corp. and Northrop Grumman Corp. might sell to win U.S. antitrust approval for their merger.

The defense electronics maker told the companies that it's interested in buying Northrop's defense units that make airborne early warning radar and missile countermeasures, a GEC spokesman said.

"We're standing by to become involved in discussions as and when any opportunities arise," said Ben Brewerton, the GEC spokesman.

The offer isn't likely to have any immediate effect on Lockheed Martin's ability to complete its proposed $11.3 billion acquisition of Northrop. The companies are embroiled in an antitrust battle with the U.S. Justice Department, which sued in late March to block the combination.

U.S. antitrust regulators filed suit after rejecting the companies' $1 billion divestiture plan, which didn't include airborne early warning radar. The government was seeking the sale of all of Northrop's defense electronics assets, worth between $3 billion and $4 billion.

Baltimore Sun
April 28, 1998 Pg. 9

North Korea to allow access for U.N. relief

WASHINGTON — North Korea has assured United Nations relief officials that it will give agency monitors access to 49 counties that were off-limits for security reasons, a top U.N. official said yesterday.

If North Korea reneges, the U.N. agency will reduce the 658,000 tons of food for 1998 by an amount proportional to the population of the 49 counties, Catherine Bertini, head of the U.N. World Food Program, told a news conference.

The promise of nationwide access for the 46 World Food Program employees, indicates great progress from a few years ago, she said.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON , WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski **NEWS DIRECTOR:** Taft Phoebus **EARLY BIRD EDITOR:** Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe **ADMINISTRATION:** Wendy Powers **PRODUCTION:** Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)